

REMARKS

The Advisory Action dated May 9, 2005 has been received and considered. In this amendment, claims 1, 36, 42, 43, 48 and 52 have been amended to clarify the scope of the claimed subject matter. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification and figures as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections of the claims therefore is respectfully requested.

Telephonic Interview of June 8, 2005

At the outset, the undersigned notes with appreciation the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephonic interview of June 8, 2005. During the Interview, the Applicants' representative proposed amending the claims to clarify that the sets of time slots are dedicated and that the time slots of the sets are fixed for a plurality of time frames. As explained by the Applicants' representative during the Interview and as discussed below, these clarifying amendments are believed to overcome the outstanding rejections of the claims.

Rejections of Claims 1-6, 25, 29 and 36-52

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-6, 25, 29 and 26-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haartsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,007) in view of Persson (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,434). In response to the Final Office Action, the Applicants noted that

Haartsen discloses a technique whereby voice communication channels hop time slots between successive frames. [*Haartsen*, col. 7, line 60-col. 8, line 4]. In contrast, claims 1, 42 and 48 recite limitations directed to the transmission or reception of voice data via a dedicated set of time slots over a plurality of time frames. As the time slots used by the voice channels are intentionally changed from frame to frame in the disclosure of Haartsen, Haartsen not only fails to disclose or suggest a dedicated set of time slots of a plurality of time frames for the transmission voice data as recited by claims 1, 42 and 48, Haartsen teaches away from these claim limitations due to the time slot "hopping" nature of the voice communication channels in the technique disclosed by Haartsen.

Response Dated March 28, 2005, p. 10.

PATENT

Responding to the Applicants' comments, the Advisory Action asserted that "the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the dedicated set of time slots assigned to the channel A should be fixed) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)." *Advisory Action*, p. 2. In an effort to advance the present application to issuance, the Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite the features of "wherein each time slot of the first and second dedicated sets of time slots has a fixed time slot position for the plurality of time frames." As stated by the Advisory Action, "the [Examiner] believes that Haartsen clearly discloses or suggest[s] transmitting voice information over a set of dedicated time slots #1-6, wherein the positions of the time slots numbers [sic] are fixed throughout a plurality of time frames and the slots are dedicated for transmitting voice information, even though the time slot position for the channel A is not fixed." *Advisory Action*, p. 2 (emphasis added). Thus, as discussed in detail in the response to the Final Office Action and as acknowledged by the Examiner in the Advisory Action, Haartsen fails to disclose or suggest dedicated sets of time slots for voice information and data information, respectively, where the time slot positions of the time slots of the dedicated sets are fixed for a plurality of time frames. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Haartsen and Persson fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of transmitting information from a voice network over a first dedicated set of time slots of a plurality of time frames and data information from a data network over a second dedicated set of time slots of the plurality of time frames wherein each time slot of the first and second dedicated sets of time slots has a fixed time slot position for the plurality of time frames as provided by amended independent claims 1, 42, 48 and 52. The Final Office Action therefore fails to establish that the proposed combination of Haartsen and Persson discloses or suggests each and every feature of claims 1, 42, 48 and 52, as well as claims 2-6, 25, 29, 36-41, 43-47 and 49-51 at least by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1, 42, 48 and 52. Moreover, these claims recite additional limitations neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1-6, 25, 29 and 36-52 is improper at this time and the withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

PATENT

Improper Period for Reply Set in Advisory Action

At the first page of the Advisory Action, the period for reply was incorrectly marked as 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The Applicants submit that the response to the rejection was mailed within two months of the final rejection (the response was filed on the first business day following the Saturday two-month date, *see M.P.E.P.* Section 706.07(f)(A)) and therefore is subject to the provisions of M.P.E.P. Section 706.07(f), which provides that the period for reply to the Advisory Action expires on the later of the mailing date of the Advisory Action or the date set forth in the final rejection. The period for reply to the Advisory Action therefore expired on May 9, 2005, the date of the mailing of the Advisory Action. Accordingly, a one-month extension of time is submitted herewith.


Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 01-0365.

Respectfully submitted,

9 June 2005
Date



Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596,
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone) (512) 327-5452 (fax)